DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 597 CS 503 280

AUTHOR Berry, Elizabeth
TITLE Emma Goldman: A Study in Female Agitation.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 29p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (San Jose, CA, February 14-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism: *Females: *Freedom of Speech: *Persuasive Discourse: Political Attitudes: *Rhetoric: Rhetorical Criticism: Sex Bias: Speech Communication: *Speeches
IDENTIFIERS Anarchy: *Goldman (Emma): Radical Movements

ABSTRACT

The role of the agitator in society and the special characteristics of women agitators--in particular, Emma Goldman, an American anarchist from the early twentieth century--are discussed in this paper. Specific examples of the rhetoric used by Emma Goldman in her speeches (supporting anarchism, against women's suffrage, against abortion control, and for birth control) and comments about her by her contemporaries are used to illustrate her style and explain her effect. (MKM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198597

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EMMA GOLDMAN: A STUDY IN FEMALE AGITATION

Elizabeth Berry
California State University, Northridge

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elizabeth Berry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503280

Presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention
February, 1981

"Besides, the art of an agitator of unpopular ideas consists in the ability to accept the station house or a hotel with the same grace."

--Emma Goldman

In American society, agitation by males has been a fairly common phenomenon and, as such, has fulfilled certain functions. The agitator, by means of persuasive discourse, stimulates discussion in a society with a view toward bringing about a profound change in that society. Agitators want change immediately and without conditions. Common to all agitators is an unrelenting intolerance for what is conceived to be societal injustice, and this intolerance motivates the agitator to speak out for a remedy, mindless of the dangers to which he or she might be subjected by advocating unpopular causes. The agitator deserves close attention because such a person symbolizes underlying social problems and reminds us of the frailities of our political institutions.

Though often regarded as "crazies," agitators have a powerful effect as change agents. Garry Wills points out:

Politicians do not bring about change. Their effort, very useful in its way, is to prevent change - to slow it down, blunt it, absorb it. That is why they need such

> persistent prodding before they will respond at all. Martin Luther King, Jr. could never have been elected to the Presidency, no matter how long he had lived. Yet he, more than any other person of the twentieth century, changed domestic conditions in this country. . . .All the initially unpopular causes, labor, universal suffrage, prohibition, civil rights, the anti-war movement - had their origins in the streets, or in the back alleys, not in electoral contests.1

When one considers the nature of agitation and the nature of women's place in our society, one might wonder if female agitation is a paradox or a redundancy. How can a female, given her "submissive nature,"consider affecting change through agitation? Female speakers throughout history, have had difficulty gaining acceptance in public life, and it was a daring few who defied society's prescribed roles and used the public platform to espouse their beliefs. And <u>any</u> woman speaking in public might be considered to be an "agitator" by virtue of her taking a public adversarial position.

Agitators, in general, inspire a number of emotions, such as hate, dread, fear, loathing, love, and devotion, but a female agitator probably rankles a society more than a male agitator, for she not only attacks American political values and institutions but also the whole American psychosocial reality, which includes appropriate behavior for women. In certain

situations and periods in our history, that a woman would dare to speak in public at all was to be considered grossly improper, and if she should dare, she must speak "in a manner becoming a lady." Women speakers were mistrusted and deemed unfeminine (therefore aberrant) for standing up and speaking their minds in public. Certainly a female agitator, attacking the establishment through strong emotional appeals and violent language was not behaving "like a lady." Even today, in the minds of many auditors, female speakers break the rules of acceptable conduct.

The woman speaker has never been looked on as a serious force in American society. Historians and rhetorical critics have paid scant attention to the role of women speakers in advocating social change, even though, contrary to common belief, all women have not always accepted the quiet help-mate role assigned to them by males. In fact, they have spoken for and against a number of causes with a ferocity and strength hardly indicative of the gender typically termed the "weaker sex." The force of female protest helped break the shackles of slavery in this country and it swung the ax against the evils of alcohol. Women's voices were heard in the cries against the despicable conditions of the workers and exploitation of child labor. Women demanded the right to vote, and they won that right, not through meek submission to the male dominated society, but rather through active agitation.

The female agitator has certain special characteristics in addition to those ascribed to any agitator. One might advance

the notion that there are two kinds of female agitators, the speaker who is an agitator and also happens to be a woman, and the speaker who is an agitator because she is a woman. In the first category, we might place the women who have advanced broadly based social, political and economic issues which have no particular relationship to either sex. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's speaking on behalf of the laborers is an example of a female agitator promoting "asexual" causes. In a second category, we could place those women who advocate reforms which are directly related to the female experience. Speakers such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, arguing for woman suffrage, and Margaret Sanger advocating birth control, illustrate how a female might have a special impact on an audience because the topics on which she speaks are very directly related to female concerns and experiences.

Despite all other characteristics, one of the most dramatic and obvious traits of the woman as she approaches the speaking platform is that she is a woman. Her effectiveness as a speaker will be dependent upon her particular audience's stereotypes and expectations of feminine behavior and upon her ability to adapt to or change those expectations. While rigid expectations of feminine behavior by various audiences may limit the female agitator's rhetorical alternatives, the feminine image she projects might also enhance some of her causes. A woman advocating birth control, describing the suffering caused by having many unaffordable children, or a mother speaking against the conditions in which children are forced to work, has a

particular emotional appeal achieved primarily by virtue of the sex of the speaker. On the other hand, a professional woman calling for equal rights before an audience which still views the woman's place as in the home might meet with a negative response simply because she is a female who, according to this audience's stereotypes, has stepped outside of her dutiful place in society. What must be remembered when viewing the female agitator in American society, is that she always has had to be aware of her sex, just as the black agitator has had to be aware of his or her color. The audience demanded, and still demands, such an awareness.

In radical circles, during the early 20th century, however, a speaker's sex seemed to matter less than her ideas and stamina. Women such as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Kate Richards O'Hare, Rose Schneiderman, Margaret Sanger and others agitated relentlessly for their individual causes. There seemed to be little question of their abilities and right to speak. They were needed by the radical groups who wanted to change society. The female speaker for radical causes in early 20th century America was not only tolerated by her male colleagues, but was encouraged to speak for the cause, and in many cases, was extremely effective, because of or in spite of, her sex.

EMMA GOLDMAN, ANARCHIST AGITATOR

One very famous female agitator of the early 20th century violated almost all of the American values as she traveled across the country speaking on subjects of universal

concern and of particular concern to women. Not only was she an avowed anarchist, but she was a foreigner, a Jew, and a woman. This combination of characteristics created an image which often interfered with the messages she proclaimed, yet often because of her uniqueness and her extensive use of rhetoric, she was able to draw attention to many significant problems of the time. She was an agitator who happened to be a woman speaking on broadly based social, political and economic issues as well as subjects particularly relevant to women. Emma Goldman's agitation exemplifies how one particular female agitator tried to affect audiences during a period of social unrest and suggests that the rhetoric of other female agitators, so often ignored by historians, might also be worthy of examination. Goldman's rhetoric can also serve to illustrate how a female speaker in the early twentieth century ignored or capitalized on her sex in her advocacy, depending on the topic and the audience.

There were few people who had not heard of Emma Goldman during the volatile days of the early twentieth century. Goldman was a woman who struck fear and trembling into the hearts of police and citizens from coast to coast. She was labeled "mischievous foreigner," "leader of the army of the unwashed,"the chief of the tribe of frousy haired specimens," and "shrieking advocate of anarchy."[2]

Born in Russia in 1869, Miss Goldman emigrated to New York in 1885. There she began working in a garment factory under deplorable conditions typical of the time. She worked ten and a half hours a day for a wage of $2.50. The shock of realizing that

America was not the utopia she had believed was one of the first formative events in her later struggle against the oppression by capital of the laboring classes. Probably the most profound event in her early years was the one that took place on November 11, 1887 in Chicago. When four anarchists were hanged for alleged complicity in the Haymarket bombing, Goldmans'purpose in life changed. She decided to become involved in radical causes.

After a brief unhappy encounter with marriage, she went to New York City where she met Johann Most and Alexander Berkman, her life-long friend and fellow anarchist. Johann Most recognized Goldman's speaking ability, and his aim was to make her a great speaker to take his place when he was gone. After a few years under the tutorship of Johann Most, she rejected his teachings and became the accepted leader of the anarchist movement in America.

Goldman's life was full of speaking and writing for a number of causes, most of them unpopular. Though the topics of her lectures ranged from modern drama to birth control to anti-conscription, she always related her talks to her philosophy of anarchism.

> I began my lecture work in New York in the year 1890, and with but few exceptions have spoken in that city every winter since that time. I have often wondered how it is that my audiences do not tire, because even the greatest orator becomes tedious if

> listened to during five months, year after year. The only explanation I have been able to find is, first the growing interest in Anarchism, and secondly, the wide range of themes embraced in my lecture courses, themes which must appeal to people in every walk of life.[3]

Emma Goldman was accused of many things, but the accusation that no doubt was the most damaging and most unfair was that she had inspired the assasin of President McKinley to commit the murder of the President. In reality, Emma hardly knew Leon Czolgosz, but because of his comment that her lectures and writings made him decide that the present form of government was all wrong, and the best way to end it was to kill the President, she was arrested. She had met him twice on lecture tours but did not know his real name. The press made great publicity of the connection between Goldman and Czolgosz, but her release by the police because of lack of evidence against her, received almost no publicity. The stigma of the assassination stayed with her throughout her life.[4]

In almost every instance when Emma Goldman was to speak, police were alerted and there was fear of riots and violence. Often, of course, this over reaction by community officials only induced more people to attend Goldman's lectures.

Typically, Emma Goldman would arrive in a city to deliver a series of lectures, and there would be difficulty in obtaining a hall in which to have a meeting. If the hall had

been rented previously by Miss Goldman or her represenative, the police would intimidate the hall owner to rescind the agreement to allow the female anarchist to speak. If she were able to arrange a hall, the police would be present to censor the remarks or to "keep a riot from breaking out." The fact that Emma Goldman could inspire such strong reaction was no doubt due to her identity with anarchism, but one suspects that the fact she was a female greatly contributed to the incendiary reaction of the American public to her speaking. Would the Madison newspapers, for example, have reacted the same way to a male as they did to a female anarchist:

> If the University socialists had carefully combed the entire country, they could not possibly have found a more notorious or more obnoxious personality on whom to lavish the civility of the institution. Servants of the state who hastened forward to shake the reckless hand of Emma Goldman may properly be shaken out of the service of the state. It is high time that dangerous misguiding teachers should themselves be taught a lasting lesson in the plainest of patriotic good citizenship.[5]

Was it her ideas or her delivery which police feared would incite a riot? It certainly was not her appearance, for as one writer observed:

> She appears as a middle aged woman of dump (sic) figure, plainly dressed and wearing glasses, and on her looks she could get past anywhere as a humdrum housewife, as bourgeois and respectable as they make them. But listen to her for five minutes, and she has you buffaloed; you are startled, and then interested and before you know it, enthusiastic. You are inexpressibly shocked to find yourself agreeing with and even applauding the most outrageous propositions.[6]

Goldman performed very effectively the role of the agitator by untiringly utilizing her rhetorical skills to promote a variety of causes.

The agitator's principle means of reaching an audience is through rhetoric. Rhetoric is the best available method of arousing attention and unrest among the malcontent and for promoting change. By addressing an audience in terms of hope for the future, the agitator emphasizes the various injustices the audience has experienced in the past and why the status quo must change. Goldman used both written and spoken rhetoric extensively, but apparently she had more faith in the written word in "educating" her audience. She wrote in the introduction to a series of her essays in 1910:

> My great faith in the wonder worker, the spoken word, is no more. I have realized its

> inadequacy to awaken thought or even emotion. Gradually, and with no small struggle against this realization, I came to see that oral propaganda is at best but a means of shaking people from their lethargy: it leaves no lasting impression. The very fact that most people attend meetings only if aroused by newspaper sensations, or because they expect to be amused, is proof that they really have no inner urge to learn.
>
> It is altogether different with the written mode of human expression. No one, unless intensely interested in progressive ideas, will bother with serious books.
>
> I am not sanguine enough to hope that my readers will be as numerous as those who have heard me. But I prefer to reach the few who really want to learn rather than the many who come to be amused.[7]

Agitators often find themselves in such a double bind, that is, they must call attention to their cause and often do so by arousing fear and interest in potential audiences, and yet if they want to truly inform, as did Emma Goldman, they are faced with audiences who are more curious about the agitator than her words. This might be even more true when a female agitator speaks out in public, for she truly is a curiosity.

Goldman, like most agitators, did use the public

platform even though she might not have had a great deal of faith in the effectiveness of oral propaganda. She seems to have seen two different functions of the spoken and written word. The spoken word was to arouse interest, excite, and agitate people. Commenting in 1911 about her tour, "Oral propaganda cannot be overlooked. The pity is we have so few who can give their time and ability to this line of agitation."[8]

One of her most successful years for speaking was 1910 when on one tour along, she visited thirty-seven cities, in twenty-five states, lecturing one hundred and twenty times to large audiences.[9] Almost all who heard her agreed that she was a powerful speaker.

> She conveyed a direct and uncompromising quality which left no doubt as to her feelings about the injustices of power, whether in capitalist or communist countries. . .In essence, she was rather a motherly figure, full of two rarely combined qualities, indignation and compassion. They were the basic stuff of her speeches, and no printed words can convey them.[10]

> She was a thoroughly honest woman who could believe most implicitly whatever she wanted to believe. She had all the intensity,

> the emotional auto-intoxication so common to the Russian Jewish radical, intensified a million fold. Words poured from her in a torrent; and she could brook no hint of opposition. But her enthusiasm and generosity were as warm and as undiscriminating as her prejudices.[11]

> An unfriendly observer, United States Attorney Francis Caffey, asserted that "Emma Goldman is a woman of great ability and of personal magnetism, and her persuasive powers are such as to make her an exceedingly dangerous woman."[12]

During the time in which Emma Goldman lived in the United States, there was a great deal of injustice and a lack of help from those in power. Protest swept the country and there was tremendous political agitation. At the dawn of the 20th century, the United States saw great industrialization, urbanization, and material accumulation. These factors acted together to foment class warfare in diverse forms, including free speech fights and labor strikes. Emma Goldman was often at the center of conflict between labor and authorities, and as suggested previously, her mere presence in a city usually acted as a catalyst for some free speech controversy, as she tried to establish lines of communication with her audiences.

One of the bitterest and longest free speech fights and one which epitomizes Goldman's relentless adherence to a principle, occurred in San Diego between 1912 and 1915, when after a series of conflicts between police and labor agitators, Emma Goldman was invited to speak. This so infuriated certain members of the San Diego community that they formed their own band of vigilantes and met Goldman and her manager, Ben Reitman, at the train when they arrived. Upon seeing the Goldman woman, someone in the crowd screamed, "Remember McKinley." Another group chanted," Emma, Emma, you put me in such a dilemma," and began rushing the hotel autobus in which Miss Goldman and Reitman were seated.[13] The driver quickily departed. Later at the hotel, the mayor advised Miss Goldman to leave town. While she was talking to him, unbeknownst to her, Reitman was being abducted by a band of vigilantes who were determined to protect San Diego from such agitators. Later Miss Goldman was informed that Reitman was safe, and since she believed there was no chance that she would be able to speak, she boarded the train for Los Angeles.[14]

What happened to Reitman at the hands of the vigilantes would be absurd, if it were not true, and if incidents like this were not common, as strife between labor and capital, disguised as free speech fights, intensified. On May 16th, Reitman's account of what had happened to him was printed in newspapers throughout the country. It was learned that Reitman had been taken thirty miles into the desert and surrounded by vigilantes. His clothing was torn off, and he was made to kneel and kiss the

American flag. With a lighted cigar, the letters I.W.W. were burned into Reitman's buttocks. A can of tar was poured over his head, and in place of the traditional feathers, brush was rubbed on his body. He was finally released after further savage acts. For Emma Goldman, the incident was one more denial of freedom of speech, and she vowed to return until freedom reigned again in San Diego.

She did return a year later, but the vigilantes were still active. When she stepped off the train, instead of an angry mob meeting her, five police officers placed her and Reitman under arrest "for protection." After a brief stay in jail, the prisoners heard the sound of vigilantes and they consented to be put on the train with the help of police. The San Diego Union interpreted this move as "the anarchists plead for police guard," and proudly stated, "City purges itself of anarchists. Drives out Goldman and her pal." But in small print, there was Emma's promise, "I'm coming back."[15]

When Emma Goldman did return again to San Diego, it was 1915, and the great exposition in Balboa was the popular attraction of the coast. The threat of the wobblies and undesirables had lessened, and the vigilantes were no longer active. San Diegoans were more confident in 1915 than in 1912. They were proud of the exposition and what it represented. No longer were they threatened by a speech by an anarchist. Thus, after three years, Emma Goldman was allowed to deliver her

previously prohibited lecture, a talk on a play by Henrik Ibsen, entitled, " Enemy of the People."

On the whole, the rhetoric of the agitator is dogmatic and unequivocal. Agitators cannot tolerate dissent from their ideas; their style reflects that the cause is usually "born of emotion."

> No secret was made of the fact that Emma Goldman and not anarchism was being offered the chance to be heard. Perhaps the good people did not know that Emma Goldman and anarchism can no more be separated than her heart from her lungs. In any event, they know it now and while they may never again be as generous, at least they will not be able to say that Emma Goldman modifies her ideas to fit the occasion.[16]

The theme of the agitator sometimes elicits the destructive impulses of the audience through use of highly emotional and action-impelling words. The audience can be carried along by the rhetoric because it has a built-in need to accept a cure for its ills. It is primarily through the use of emotional appeals and passionate language that the agitator convinces an audience that change is needed, and this change has to be initiated from outside the establishment, from the audience.

Goldman was very fond of using metaphors to stir up the

emotions of her audience. In her lecture on "Marriage and Love," she used emotionally charged language in comparing a married woman to a parasite.

> The institution of marriage makes a parasite of woman, an absolute dependent. It incapacitates her for life's struggle, annihilates her social consciousness, paralyzes her imagination, and then imposes its gracious protection, which is in reality a snare, travesty on human character.[17]

Emma Goldman's views on woman suffrage might at first seem strange for a female agitator of the early twentieth century; yet if one realizes that as an anarchist, Goldman rejected the idea of any government control, it reasonably follows that woman suffrage only serves to perpetuate an unjust system. In the conclusion of her lecture, "Woman Suffrage," she spoke as a woman to women warning them of the dangers of relying on suffrage to change their situation.

> Her development, her freedom, her independence must come from and through herself. First, by asserting herself as a personality, and not as a sex commodity; second, by refusing the right to anyone over her body; by refusing to bear children, unless she wants them; by refusing to be a servant to God, the State, society, the husband, the family, etc; by making her life simpler, but

> deeper and richer. That is, by trying to learn the meaning and substance of life in all its complexities, by freeing herself from the fear of public opinion and public condemnation. Only that, and not the ballot, will set women free, will make her a force hitherto unknown in the world, a force for real love, for peace, for harmony; a force of divine fire, of life giving: a creator of free men and women.[18]

Emma Goldman, like many agitators, used the courtroom to espouse her ideas, for there she had a wider forum than usually accorded her. In July, 1917, Goldman was on trial for speaking against conscription at a mass rally. In her speech to the jury, she used a number of emotional appeals and an analogy which clearly illustrate her view of the agitator's role:

> And so gentlemen, I wish to emphasize this very important fact, because I know how you feel on the war, I know what patriotism means to you: that the mere accident of birth or the mere fact that you have taken out citizens' papers does not make a man necessarily a patriot. Who is the real patriot, or rather what is the kind of patriotism that we represent? The kind of patriotism we represent is the kind of patriotism which loves America with open eyes.

> Our relation toward America is the same as the relation of a man who loves a woman, who is enchanted by her beauty and yet who cannot be blind to her defects. And so I wish to state here, in my own behalf and in behalf of hundreds of thousands whom you decry and state to be antipatriotic, that we love America, we love her beauty, we love her riches, we love her mountains and her forests, and above all we love the people who have produced her wealth and riches, who have created all her beauty. We love the dreamers and the philosophers and the thinkers who are giving America liberty. But that must not make use blind to the faults of America. That cannot compel us to be inarticulate to the terrible wrongs committed in the name of patriotism and in the name of the country.[19]

An agitator usually does not have to establish a need for the planned reform; the need is obvious to all the listeners. The task is to voice the problem graphically, or as one writer put it:

> To bring to flame the smoldering resentment of his listeners, to express loudly and brazenly and to lend social sanction to

> actions that might otherwise seem dangerous temptations. He works, as it were, from inside the audience, stirring up what lies dormant there.[20]

A few examples of Emma Goldman's rhetoric reveal her ability to express the frustrations of her audience in strong, uncompromising terms.

> I may be arrested, I may be tried and thrown into jail, but I never will be silent. I never will acquiesce or submit to authority, nor will I make peace with a system which degrades woman to a mere incubator and which fattens on her innocent victims. I now and here declare war upon this system and shall not rest until the path has been cleared for a free motherhood and a healthy, joyous, and happy childhood.[21]

Using her own experiences as a nurse, she described the results of unwanted pregnancies:

> I have been in the great social movement of this City for twenty-six years, as a trained nurse, as a lecturer and as a publisher. During this time, I have seen conditions so appalling that the most creative

artist could not adequately describe it. I am not going to take up the time of the Court or of Your Honor in going into details. I only want to call your attention to just a few such cases. I have come across a case of a woman who is married to a consumptive husband, who is the mother of eight children and is on the way with the ninth; those children are in the tuberculosis hospital. I have come across another case where the man makes twelve dollars a week, the woman is the mother of six children and is on the way with the seventh child. I have myself, taken care of a case where a woman was the mother of twelve children; she died in confinement with the thirteenth, and the mainstay of the family, the oldest child, is only fourteen years old. These are but a very few cases of our economic grinding mill, which places a premium upon poverty, and upon the laws which make a conspiracy of silence a virtue. . . . If to teach people how to bring better children into the world so that they shall not become paupers or fill the hospital or reformatories, or end in crime, if that is considered a crime and an offense, I am willing to stand convicted. . . .[22]

Agitators exhibit a profound faith in the future; that is, they usually profess to have faith in the future if their plan is accepted. They often contrast the future with the intolerable past and present, ignoring potential problems inherent in their particular solutions. "Face to face with an audience, Emma Goldman was a forceful and witty propagandist. Frequently she lifted her rapt hearers to heights from which they envisioned a world wholly free and completely delightful."[23] She pictured a world far better than the one familiar to the audience. Her answers were simple, somtimes too simple, but her audience wanted and needed to believe her. Her self-assuredness, in spite of her gender, generated confidence and belief in her and her ideas.

The lecture, "Anarchism, What it Really Stands For," was delivered a number of times in Miss Goldman's career. In this lecture, she tried to refute the negative conception of anarchism and promote a positive view of this philosophy. In this lengthy and somewhat dry lecture, Goldman defines anarchism as a "the philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary."[24] She pictured a society where men would be:

> ...free to choose the mode of work, the conditions of work, and the freedom to work. One to whom the making of a table, the building of a house or the tilling of the soil

> is to the artist and the discovery to the scientist.[25]

She concludes her lecture by showing how anarchism will usher in a new, better world:

> Anarchism, the great leaven of thought, is today permeating every phase of human endeavor. Science, art, literature, the drama, the effort for economic betterment, in fact every individual and social opposition to the existing disorder of things, is illumined by the spiritual light of anarchism. It is the philosophy of the sovereignty of the individual. It is the theory of social harmony. It is the great, surging, living truth that is reconstructing the world, and that will usher in the dawn."[26]

SIGNIFICANCE OF EMMA GOLDMAN'S AGITATION

Emma Goldman performed the function of any agitator in society, but because of her unique combination of philosophy, gender, and rhetorical skill, she had influence on more than her limited band of followers. She was one of those rare female speakers who spoke out on topics which had universal applicability as well as on topics particularly relevant to women. Undergirding all of her agitation was her belief in

individual liberty. This motivated her to fight for free speech, to advocate birth control, to argue against conscription, and reject woman suffrage.

She gave courage to those perhaps less likely to stand up for what they believed. It might be argued that a woman uncompromisingly defying authorities as Goldman did had more impact than a male, for a member of "the weaker sex" had to be twice as tough as a man. Floyd Dell captured the essence of Emma Goldman's agitation:

> She has a legitimate social function - that of holding before our eyes the ideal of freedom. She is licensed to taunt us with our moral cowardice, to plant in our souls the nettles of remorse at having acquiesced so tamely in brutal artifice of present day society.27

Emma Goldman employed extensively both written and spoken agitation. Her magnetic and uncompromising qualities as well as her relentless adherence to the principle of free speech made her an effective voice. She was dogmatic and unequivocal, as are most agitators, and her emotional appeals and passionate language aroused her listeners. She expressed the underlying problems of our society graphically with a profound faith in the future. Whether it was through her printed essays, her monthly magazine, Mother Earth, the lecture platform, or the courtroom, Goldman provoked Americans to think about the realities of

justice and freedom. The epitaph inscribed on her gravestone aptly summarizes the philosophy which motivated this female agitator: "Liberty will not descend to a people; a people must raise themselves to liberty."

NOTES

1 "Feminists and Other Useful Fanatics, The Politics of Crazy Jane," Harper's, June, 1976, p. 40.

2 See Richard Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) for various descriptions of Goldman.

3 Mother Earth, IX, April 1914, p. 53.

4 The McKinley assasination not only affected the reputation of Emma Goldman but prompted a policy of legislative repression aimed at aliens and ended in the Immigration Act of 1903. See William Preston, Aliens and Dissenters, Federal Suppression of Radicals, 1903-1933 (New York: Harper and Row), p. 4. See also, John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), p. 111, and Sidney Fine, "Anarchism and the Assasination of McKinley," American Historical Review, July 1955, pp. 777-799.

5 Wausau Daily, February 19, 1910 in Theodore Herfurth Papers, Wisconsin State Historical Society.

6 Newspaper clipping by Henry Tyrell, n.d. Special Collections, University of California, Los Angeles.

7 Anarchism and Other Essays (New York: Mother Earth Publishing Co., 1910), pp. 47-48.

8 Mother Earth, VI, July 1911, p. 156.

9 Drinnon, p. 130.

10 Personal letter from Roger Baldwin to author, March 20, 1965.

11 Lillian Symes and Clement Travers, Rebel America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934), p. 238.

12 Drinnon, p. 21.

13 San Diego Union, May 15, 1912, p. 1.

14 Emma Goldman, Living My Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1931), pp. 495-498.

15 May 20, 1913, p. 1.

16 Mother Earth, IX, January 1915, p. 363.

17 Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 241.

18 Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 217.

19 Mother Earth, XII, July 1917, p. 158.

20 Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman, "Portrait of The American Agitator," in Daniel Katz, et al. Public Opinion and Propaganda (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1954), p. 478.

21 Mother Earth, XI, April 1916, p. 475.

22 "Emma Goldman Before the Bar: The People of the State of New York Against Emma Goldman," Mother Earth, XI, May 1916, pp. 496-503.

23 Charles Madison, Critics and Crusaders: A Century of American Protest (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1959), p. 226.

24 Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 56.

25 Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 61.

26 Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 73.

27 Drinnon, p. 142.